

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/032,014	AZAD, MINA M.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Yemane M. Gerezgiher	2144

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Yemane M. Gerezgiher. (3) Raj Krishnan.

(2) Jeffrey Measures (Reg. # 40,272). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 06 December 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 24-27.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

With the SPE's (William Vaughn) permission, the examiner, applicant's attorney of record, Mr. Measures and Mr. Krishnan discussed a proposed amendment to the claims in an attempt to place this instant application in better form for allowance. In particular, we have discussed a proposed claim 27, written in independent form including therein the functional limitations of claims 24-26 and similar amendment in parallel in all independent claims 34, 36 and 39. The inventive entity authorized entry of the proposed amendment via examiner's amendment.